UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,301	08/29/2005	David Jackson	23133-09966	6010
758 FENWICK & V	7590 04/09/200 VEST LLP	EXAMINER		
SILICON VAL		LUKTON, DAVID		
801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/525,301	JACKSON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	DAVID LUKTON	1654
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Ja 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-114 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 51-81,84-93,96-106 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-50,82,83,94,95,107 and 108 are su Application Papers	<u>and 109-114</u> is/are withdrawn fro	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all accomposed and all accomposed and accomposed accomposed and accomposed ac	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application Number: 10/525,301 Page 2

Art Unit: 1654

Applicants' election of Group I is acknowledged (claims 1-50, 82, 83, 94, 95, 107, 108). Applicants' response to the species election requirement is also acknowledged.

Applicants have traversed the restriction requirement. One argument advanced by applicants is that if an examiner in Australia abstains from imposing a restriction requirement in a PCT application, an examiner in the U.S. is obligated to abstain from imposing the same in the corresponding national phase application. However, this is entirely untrue, even when the two examiners are employees of the same patent office. Applicants have also argued that in "371" cases, applicants enjoy blanket "immunity" from restrictions, provided that they have made some sort of assertion in the specification as to how one could use the various inventions (at issue) together. However, this is not true. If one of the inventions fails to "define a contribution" over the prior art, then a restriction can be justified. A genus can meet this test even if 99.99% of the embodiments are completely novel. All that is required is for the examiner to find just one embodiment within the claimed genus in order for the invention to short of "defining a The examiner asserts that there exists at least one embodiment within contribution". the scope of claim that can be rejected as obvious over the prior art. No evidence to support this proposition is provided at the present time. In the event that such evidence is not forthcoming, the examiner will be forced to concede applicants' position. The conclusion of this particular dialog will have to await the additional passage of time.

Application Number: 10/525,301 Page 3

Art Unit: 1654

Further definition of the elected compound is now sought. What is required (under 35 U.S.C. §121) is an election of a fully defined lipopeptide that falls within the scope of claim 1 and which is consistent with the previous election. It may be that the elected compound will conform to the following formula wherein "Th" is the peptide of SEQ ID NO:1, "B" is the peptide of SEQ ID NO: 2, R₂ and R₃ are both palmitic acid, and "Y" is the dipeptide Ser-Ser. If not, applicants can elect some other structure.

$$[Th] \xrightarrow{H} [B]$$

$$R_2 \xrightarrow{O} O$$

$$R_3$$

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Application Number: 10/525,301 Page 4

Art Unit: 1654

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. \Rightarrow 103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can be reached at (571)272-0562. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

/David Lukton/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654